

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 22 are pending in the present application and currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103. The claims as amended above and the remarks herein are considered fully responsive to the office action and entry and allowance of the amended claims is requested.

Examiner Interview Summary: Attorney for the applicant and Examiners Zeender and Champagne conducted a telephonic interview regarding the office action. Attorney for applicant noted that the primary reference – Berger - teaches an applet construct utilized to separate screen level functionality from other application logic. SEE Berger at Col. 7, Lines 20 – 55. It is further asserted that the applet construct of Berger is distinguished from the integrated repository construct of the present application. The Examiners assert that if the “integrated repositories” language as recited in the claims is interpreted as broadly as reasonably possible by one skilled in the art area in light of the specification that “integrated repositories” can be anticipated by a “plurality of data systems” as disclosed by Berger in Col. 2, Lines 40 – 65. Attorney for the Applicant respectfully disagreed that one skilled in the art would not reach this conclusion when the term “integrated repositories” is interpreted as broadly as reasonably possible – **in light of the specification** – emphasis added. The Examiners suggested that further limiting this language “integrated repositories” with language from the specification should further clarify this distinction. Attorney for the Applicant respectfully disagreed that this was necessary because the interpretation as broadly as reasonably possible can not be done in a vacuum, but must consider the context of the specification and encouraged a further read of the specification.

Application of: Brian K. Fetting, et al.
Serial No.: 10/708,013
Amendment A

The claims as amended recite an integrated group of data repositories including a user interface (UI) repository, a data binding repository and a screen repository where said repositories are linked to various object oriented applications executable at runtime to perform data binding, field definition and screen arrangement. None of the references taken individually or in combination teach or suggest a computing system having an integrated group of data repositories which define an element of a graphical user interface. For example, Berger teaches an application based on the use of software applets with a master controlling applet which does not teach or suggest the data repository limitation. Further, the plurality of data systems on a WAN can not be interpreted in any manner to anticipate the recited limitation. Further, Berger in combination with one or more of the references cited by the Examiner does not teach or suggest this limitation.

If any issue regarding the allowability of any of the pending claims in the present application could be readily resolved, or if other action could be taken to further advance this application such as an Examiner's amendment, or if the Examiner should have any questions regarding the present amendment, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner please telephone Applicant's undersigned attorney in this regard.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

July 25, 2008



Mark E. Stallion
Reg. No. 46,132
Husch Blackwell Sanders LLP
720 Olive Street, Suite 2400
St. Louis, MO 63101
314-345-6000
ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT